DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 695 SP 028 481

AUTHOR Berg, Marlowe; Nagel, Thomas
TITLE The Cajon Valley Union School District/San Diego State University Model Education Center (MEC).
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Arlington, VA, February 12-15, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Research Utilization; School Effectiveness; Staff Development; *Student Teachers; *Team Teaching

ABSTRACT

The Cajon Valley/San Diego State University Model Education Center (MEC) focuses on the training of elementary school teachers, teacher inservice, and collaborative leadership. It provides an exemplary training site for preparing elementary school teachers, and uses staff development to create a school environment/climate which will produce increased student learning within the school. The school is run by a Coordinating Team consisting of the principal and two university teacher educators. Teachers are organized into teaching teams and much effort has been devoted to providing inservice training to meet teacher needs for building effective teams. The basic focus for school improvement at the MEC is to utilize the factors identified in the research literature on school effectiveness. All university coursework is conducted on-site at the MEC, and student teachers have the opportunity to participate in staff development with teachers. Every teacher is a master teacher and works with student teachers through a three semester program. A masters degree program is conducted on-site and is available for any interested teacher. A Residency Program is designed to provide a support system for teachers in new assignments. Appended to this report are evaluation data on the program and an outline of the MEC three year plan. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED277695

# THE CAJON VALLEY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT/ SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY MODEL EDUCATION CENTER (M E C)

Marlowe Berg and Thomas Nagel

The Cajon Valley/SDSU Model Education Center (MEC) partnership was implemented at Cuyamaca Elementary School in August 1984 after one and a half years of joint planning between the two institutions. The project addresses the many calls for school reform at all levels, and focuses on the training of elementary student teachers, teacher inservice, and collaborative leadership in a new, open organizational structure. Its prime goals are to provide an exemplary training site for the preparation of elementary student teachers, and to use staff development to create a school environment/climate which will produce increased student learning within the school

To accomplish these goals, the organization of the school was changed radically. The school is run on a day to day basis by a Coordinating Team consisting of the principal (Ms. Andrea Elliott) and two university teacher educators (Dr. Marlowe Berg and Dr. Thomas Nagel). Teachers are organized into teaching teams across grades K-3 and 4-6, and each team deals with 90 to 100 children. Such teaching teams are recommended by John Goodlad in his book A Place Called School, and not only relieve the

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Berg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



SP 018 820

isolation of the teacher in the classroom, but make it more possible to meet the individual needs of children. As a result, much effort has been devoted to inservicing expressed teacher needs for building effective teams.

Programmatic matters are addressed by a Program Committee made up of the Coordinating Team, teachers, district specialists, and university faculty. Oversight for the MEC is provided by a twelve member Policy Board which include the district superintendent and the Dean of the College of Education.

The basic focus for school improvement at the MEC is to utilize the factors identified in the research literature on school effectiveness. In the spring 1985, the County Deparmtent of Education conducted an extensive study of the MEC to determine its needs on each of these factors. From this assessment, the whole staff working together agreed upon a set of priorities for staff development. This has been an on-going process which is based upon a series of needs assessments and other formative evaluations.

From the beginning the MEC was impacted with student teachers working toward elementary certification. All university coursework is conducted on-site at the MEC, and student teachers often have the opportunity to participate in staff development with teachers. Every teacher is a master teacher and works with student teachers through a three semester program (post BA). All teachers and university supervisors are trained in the use of clinical supervision techniques. The program for student teachers not only meets alls state requirements, but is tailored to meet district priorities (e.g., clinical teaching, direct instruction, children with special needs, etc.). Many teachers at the MEC are used for short

periods as instructors for student teachers, and all MEC staff have status as university Adjunct Faculty.

A masters degree program was started in fall 1985, and is also conducted on-site at the MEC for any teacher in the district interested in participating. This program is spread out over a two year period, and the first twenty one graduates will complete their studies at the end of the next academic year.

The MEC has also established a Residency Program (induction) for new teachers and experienced teachers in new assignments. This program is designed to provide a support system for teachers in new assignments, and melds the resources of the district, county office of education, and the university in a manner to meet the individual needs of each teacher in a non-evaluative environment.

The efforts of the MEC are considered to have been very successful by the district administration, Board of Education, and the university. The district Staff Development Council is working on plans through which the MEC will become a key "demonstration center" for inservice activities. Also, there are joint intentions to duplicate the efforts of the MEC at the junior high school level, and other districts have expressed desires to replicate the project in collaboration with the university.

The district has been so pleased with the first group of student teachers completing the program at the MEC that 100% have been offered contracts for employment. Additionally, a School Quality Review conducted by teachers from other districts in April 1986 was extremely laudatory, and awarded commendations in the areas of school environment, leadership, and written language. The final report commented, "In summary, we can say that the focus on excellence is readily visible at Cuyamca School (MEC).

From our interviews and observations we found high morale, a focus on excellence, an enthusiastic group of educators who work harmoniously at school as well as with community and parents." "From observation and interview it is obvious that parents and staff are enthusiastic about their program and that all are involved in the problem solving process and design of the school plan. The strong support network which has been implemented is commendable."

Lastly, scores on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) have generally made good gains in all areas, and parents have perceived a marked improvement in the school over the two year period.

Background Factors for 1985-86:
Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) = 23%
Free Lunch = 36%
School was ranked 14 out of 18 in the district on these factors

Standardized Test Results In Reading

| | CTBS NCE's | | | | CAP Scaled Scores | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | Diff. 86-84 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | Diff. 86-84 |
| K | 49 | 51 | 62* | +13 | | | | |
| 1 | 38 | 50 | 48 | +10 | | | | |
| 2 | 46 | 54 | 48 | +2 | | | | |
| 3 | 44 | 47 | 47 | +3 | 242 | 247 | 254 | +12 |
| 4 | 47 | 49 | 49 | +2 | | | | |
| 5 | 45 | 43 | 49 | +4 | | | | |
| 6 | 51 | 50 | 58* | +7 | 238 | 235 | 272 | +34 |

* Above expectation of NCE = 48 based on background factors

Standardized Test Results In Language

| | CTBS NCE's | | | | CAP Scaled Scores | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | Diff. 86-84 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | Diff. 86-84 |
| 1 | 43 | 56 | 54* | +11 | | | | |
| 2 | 42 | 63 | 54* | +12 | | | | |
| 3 | 46 | 48 | 53* | +7 | 239 | 260 | 256 | +15 |
| 4 | 46 | 46 | 54* | +8 | | | | |
| 5 | 43 | 45 | 49 | +6 | | | | |
| 6 | 53 | 48 | 61* | +8 | 231 | 269 | 290 | +59 |

* Above expectation of NCE = 48 based on background factors

Standardized Test Results In Mathematics

| | CTBS NCE's | | | | CAP Scaled Scores | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | Diff. 86-84 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | Diff. 86-84 |
| K | 56 | 54 | 62* | +6 | | | | |
| 1 | 47 | 56 | 59* | +12 | | | | |
| 2 | 56 | 62 | 60* | +4 | | | | |
| 3 | 55 | 54 | 52* | -3 | 265 | 257 | 262 | -3 |
| 4 | 52 | 51 | 59* | +7 | | | | |
| 5 | 56 | 52 | 55* | -1 | | | | |
| 6 | 64 | 54 | 61* | -3 | 274 | 252 | 265 | -9 |

* Above expectation of NCE = 48 based on background factors

Attitude Toward School and Self
For Chapter I Students
In Grades 4, 5, & 6

| | N | Score* | SE |
|---|---|---|---|
| Spring 1985 | 64 | 2.16 | .06 |
| Spring 1986 | 59 | 2.26 | .08 |
| Diff. 86-85 | | +.10 | |

* A score of 3 is high and 1 is low

Attitude Toward School and Self
For Chapter I & Non-Chapter I Students
In Grades 4, 5, & 6
Spring 1986

| | N | Score* | SE |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chapter I | 59 | 2.26 | .08 |
| Non-Chapter I | 118 | 2.32 | .05 |
| Difference | | +.06 | |

* A score of 3 is high and 1 is low

Semantic Differential Questionnaire Results
From Policy Board Members (PB), Master Teachers (MT),
Student Teachers (ST), and Parents (P) -- Spring 1987

THE MODEL EDUCATION CENTER

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Exciting | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Dull |
| PB | 5* | 1 | | | | | | | |
| MT | 9* | 7 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| ST | 4 | 6* | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | | |
| P | 19 | 10 | 20* | 9 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Humanistic | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Mechanistic |
| PB | 5* | 1 | | | | | | | |
| MT | 8* | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| ST | 6* | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | |
| P | 9 | 23* | 13 | 9 | 2 | | | | |
| Good | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Bad |
| PB | 5* | 1 | | | | | | | |
| MT | 14* | 4 | | 1 | | | | | |
| ST | 8* | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| P | 23* | 14 | 13 | 10 | 1 | | | | |
| Irrelevant | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Relevant |
| PB | | | | | | | | 6* | |
| MT | | | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 14* | |
| ST | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9* | |
| P | 4 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 16* | |
| Flexible | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Rigid |
| PB | 2 | 3* | 1 | | | | | | |
| MT | 7* | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | | |
| ST | 4 | 2 | 7* | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| P | 13 | 16* | 15 | 10 | 5 | | 1 | | |
| Isolated | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Collaborative |
| PB | | | | | | | 1 | 5* | |
| MT | | | | 2 | | 1 | 6 | 10* | |
| ST | | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8* | |
| P | 4 | 3 | 2 | 11* | 6 | 10 | 11* | 8 | |
| Organized | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Disorganized |
| PB | 5* | 1 | | | | | | | |
| MT | 11* | 5 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| ST | 6* | 4 | 6* | | | | | | |
| P | 26* | 18 | 9 | 5 | 2 | | | | |
| Professional | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Unprofessional |
| PB | 6* | | | | | | | | |
| MT | 16* | 2 | | 1 | | | | | |
| ST | 9* | 4 | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| P | 22 | 23* | 11 | 4 | 1 | | | | |

Semantic Differential Questionnaire Results Continued:

THE MODEL EDUCATION CENTER

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Valueless |
| PB | 6* | | | | | | | | |
| MT | 14* | 4 | | 1 | | | | | |
| ST | 11* | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | | | |
| P | 29* | 17 | 6 | 8 | | | | | |
| Impersonal | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Personal |
| PB | | | | | | | | 6* | |
| MT | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 7 | 8* | |
| ST | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6* | 6* | |
| P | 6 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 15* | 12 | |
| Pleasant | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Unpleasant |
| PB | 6* | | | | | | | | |
| MT | 9* | 6 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| ST | 2 | 7* | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| P | 24* | 16 | 17 | 4 | | | | | |
| Frustrating | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Satisfying |
| PB | | | | | | | 2 | 4* | |
| MT | | | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7* | 6 | |
| ST | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5* | 2 | |
| P | 4 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 13 | 19* | |
| Original | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Unimaginative |
| PB | 4* | 2 | | | | | | | |
| MT | 5 | 9* | 3 | 2 | | | | | |
| ST | 7* | 5 | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| P | 17 | 21* | 11 | 9 | 1 | | | | |
| Current | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Passe |
| PB | 6* | | | | | | | | |
| MT | 11* | 4 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| ST | 9* | 5 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| P | 20* | 19 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Friendly | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | Unfriendly |
| PB | 6* | | | | | | | | |
| MT | 14* | 2 | 3 | | | | | | |
| ST | 8* | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| P | 29* | 22 | 6 | 4 | | | | | |

## SELF REPORT ON CHANGE IN TEACHING BEHAVIORS OVER TIME

Think back to who you were as a teacher three years ago, and then who you are today. Using the form below, try to determine the degree to which you engaged in the identified behaviors three years ago today. 1 would be high, 6 would be low.

| | 3 Years Ago | | | | | | Today | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Coaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7* | 4* | 4* | 7 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Clinical Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7* | 8* | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clinical Supervision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8* | 9* | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Functioning Teams | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7* | 11* | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Critical Thinking Skills | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4* | 3 | 6* | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Curriculum Alignment | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5* | 1 | 3 | 6* | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Implementing School Effectiveness Variables | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4* | 2 | 4* | 7* | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ELEPS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11* | 3 | 4* | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Instruction in Literature | 2 | 0 | 3* | 2 | 3* | 1 | 4* | 4* | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Accurate Reading Placement Of Students | 3 | 4* | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7* | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Homework Implementation | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4* | 3 | 10* | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Schoolwide Discipline Plan | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4* | 4* | 9* | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cooperative Learning | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 5* | 3 | 7* | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Raising Expectations | 5* | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9* | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Writing Instruction | 2 | 4* | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 6* | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Skill Development in Physical Education | 2 | 4* | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4* | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Computer Assisted Instruction | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7* | 3* | 1 | 1 | 3* | 2 | 3* |

MEC THREE YEAR PLAN

Draft Two

| | GOAL | 1984-85 | 1985-86 | 1986-87 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | THE EDUCATION OF STUDENTS AT THE MEC WILL BE ENHANCED THROUGH APPLYING THE PRINCIPLES OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH TO IMPROVE SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT AND TO CREATE A MORE POSITIVE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND AND CLIMATE. | Needs assessment on school effectiveness & teacher effectiveness.<br><br>Monitor and assess attitude and comfort of participants at the MEC.<br><br>Effects of teaming & deploying: teacher comfort & student comfort. | Implementation of school effectiveness variables in classrooms; inservice training & observation in classrooms. | Standardized achievement test scores of both middle & low socio-economic status children taught by teachers at the MEC will improve.<br><br>Attitude of teachers, student teachers, parents, resource teachers, school administrators, & participating university faculty will evidence above average satisfaction with the program and its accomplishments.<br><br>Academic self-concept of children at the MEC will improve relative to the baseline year (1984-1985). |
| B | THE SKILLS OF MANY CAJON VALLEY TEACHERS WILL BE STRENGTHENED THROUGH THE OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH AT THE MEC FOR LIMITED PERIODS OF TIME, OR TAKING PART IN INSERVICE ACTIVITIES AT THE MEC WHILE CONTINUING TO TEACH IN OTHER SCHOOLS. | Start staff development program on-site.<br><br>Begin clinical teaching & supervision workshops for staff.<br><br>Develop & implement a series of team building workshops. | Implement inservice course offerings (continue staff development on-site, MA for district, & paraprofessional sequences).<br><br>Implement clinical teaching & supervision practices on-site.<br><br>Continue to implement team building workshops. | Teacher classroom behavior will change to evidence the incorporation of practices identified in the training and research literature. |
| C | THE CENTER WILL PROVIDE FOR THE ON-SITE TRAINING AND SUPERVISION OF SDSU STUDENT TEACHERS WHICH MODELS THE PRINCIPLES IDENTIFIED WITH EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS. | Develop & begin integrated student teaching program.<br><br>Begin clinical teaching & supervision for student teachers. | Complete first cycle of 3 semester basic credential program. Begin 2nd cycle.<br><br>Student teachers at the MEC will have mastered the skills identified in the | Continue 2nd cycle of student teaching program.<br><br>Student teachers from first cycle will express an above average level |

| | GOAL | 1984-85 | 1985-86 | 1986-87 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| C (cont'd) | | | literature on effective schools, as well as all other skills required to become certified in California.<br><br>Continue clinical teaching and supervision for student teachers.<br><br>Develop intern program for graduates of the credential program. | of satisfaction with their program of preparation. |
| D | THE CENTER WILL OFFER OPPORTUNITIES WHERE EXEMPLARY CLASSROOM AND SUPERVISORY PRACTICES CAN BE OBSERVED BY TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, UNIVERSITY STUDENTS, INTERNS, PARENTS, AIDES, AND VISITORS FROM CAJON VALLEY. | Begin site visitation.<br><br>Integrate special education students; bilingual program, and Chapter I. | Implement systematic site visitation plan.<br><br>Teachers at the MEC will demonstrate clinical teaching practices, effective teaming, & new district curricular programs. | Teachers at the MEC will continue to demonstrate clinical teaching practices, effective teaming, & new district curricular programs. |
| E | AN OPPORTUNITY FOR CLOSE UNIVERSITY-PUBLIC SCHOOL COOPERATION WILL OCCUR IN SUCH AREAS AS TEACHER TRAINING AND CURRICULUM COORDINATION. | Continue SDSU-Cajon Valley collaboration. | Develop closer alignment between college courses & classroom practices.<br><br>Continue collaboration between SDSU & CVUSD.<br><br>SDSU & CVUSD will collaborate on the development & implementation of a coordinated supervision model. | The college course content & practices applied in the school classrooms will be in close alignment.<br><br>A coordinated supervision model will be in place. |